

## Remarks

In the present RCE, three claims (1, 10, and 19) are amended. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

### I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,717,648 (Davis). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Since Davis neither teaches nor suggests each element in the claims, these claims are allowable over Davis.

Each of the independent claims recites numerous recitations that are not taught or even suggested in Davis. By way of example, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended to recite that “the cache and the memory array are separate entities that are coupled together.” Nowhere does Davis teach or even suggest these recitations. By contrast, figure 1 in Davis shows a single integrated circuit chip 10 that has a cache 40, a CPU 20, a memory management unit 30, and a bus unit 24 (see Davis at column 5, lines 41-44). Notice that the integrated circuit chip 10 in Davis does not include separate elements of a cache and a memory array that are coupled together.

In the “Response to Arguments” section, the Examiner states that the independent claims do not recite that “the memory array and the cache must be separate entities that are coupled together” (see FOA of 08/01/06 at pages 15 and 16). The independent claims are amended to recite “the cache and the memory array are separate entities that are coupled together.”

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place this application in condition for allowance.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 10, and 19 and their dependent claims are allowable over Davis.

## **II. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of USPN 6,628,598 (Edwards). This rejection is traversed.

As noted in section I, Davis does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claim 1. Edwards fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least the reasons provided in section I with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claim 4 is allowable over Davis and Edwards.

## **III. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 7-9 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of USPN 6,163,477 (Tran). This rejection is traversed.

As noted in section I, Davis does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 19. Tran fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least the reasons provided in section I with respect to independent claims 1 and 19, respective dependent claims 7-9 and 22 are allowable over Davis and Tran.

## **IV. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)**

Claims 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Davis in view of USPN 6,266,700 (Baker). This rejection is traversed.

As noted in section I, Davis does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent claims 10 and 19. Baker fails to cure these deficiencies. Thus for at least the reasons provided in section I with respect to independent claims 10 and 19, respective dependent claims 16 and 21 are allowable over Davis and Baker.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Hewlett-Packard Company**  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren  
Reg. No. 40,709  
Ph: 832-236-5529